

# Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Vanguard University

## Professional Services Division

February 27, 2008

### Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at Vanguard University. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

### Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions For all Programs offered by the Institution

#### Common Standards (1998)

	Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Standard 1: Education Leadership	<b>X</b>		
Standard 2: Resources		<b>X</b>	
Standard 3: Faculty	<b>X</b>		
Standard 4: Evaluation		<b>X</b>	
Standard 5: Admission	<b>X</b>		
Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	<b>X</b>		
Standard 7: School Collaboration	<b>X</b>		
Standard 8: District Field Supervisors	<b>X</b>		

#### Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject	19	11	4	4
Single Subject	19	12	4	3
Clear Credential	6	6		

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
Committee on Accreditation  
Accreditation Team Report**

**Institution:** Vanguard University

**Dates of Visit:** February 24-27, 2008

**Team Recommendation:** Accreditation with Technical Stipulations

**Rationale:**

The unanimous recommendation for Vanguard University was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards -

The total team reviewed each element of the eight Common Standards and decided as to whether the standard was met, not met, or met concerns. **Standard 2: Resources** is 'Met with Concerns' and **Standard 4: Evaluation** is 'Met with Concerns.' All other Common Standards are Met.

Program Standards –

Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for each of the programs. Following these discussions of each program reviewed, the total team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns or not met. In the Multiple Subject Program, eleven standards are 'Met,' four standards are 'Met with Concerns,' and four standards are not met. In the Single Subject Program, twelve standards are 'Met,' four standards 'Met with Concerns,' and three standards 'Not Met.' All standards were 'Met' in the Clear Credential Program.

Overall Recommendation –

Due to the two Common Standards 'Met with Concerns,' and the program standards 'Met with Concerns' or 'Not Met,' the team reached consensus on the accreditation recommendation of **Accreditation with Technical Stipulations.**

## Accreditation Recommendations

The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for Teacher Preparation for Vanguard University and all of its credential programs: **Accreditation with Technical Stipulations**

Following are the recommended stipulations:

1. That the unit provide evidence that all program and Common Standards less than fully met are now met.
2. That the unit provide evidence of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and other stakeholders. The system must provide evidence of how the data is analyzed and used for program improvement.
3. That the unit provide evidence that candidates are provided with explicit theoretical grounding throughout the coursework.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Multiple Subject  
Multiple Subject
- Single Subject  
Single Subject
- Clear Credential Program

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Vanguard University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Vanguard University be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2014-2015 academic year subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation visits by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

## Accreditation Team

<b>Team Leader:</b>	<b>Cathy Buell</b> San Jose State University
<b>Common Standards Cluster:</b>	<b>Edmundo Litton</b> Loyola Marymount University
<b>Basic Credential Programs Cluster:</b>	<b>Mary Humphreys</b> Retired K-12 teacher  <b>Mel Hunt</b> St. Mary's College of California  <b>David Wescott</b> Retired K-12 teacher
<b>Staff to the Accreditation Team</b>	<b>Helen Hawley, Consultant</b>

### Documents Reviewed

University Catalog	Candidate Portfolios
Institutional Self Study	Candidate Work Samples
Course Syllabi	Schedule of Classes
Candidate Files	Advisement Documents
Fieldwork Handbook	Faculty Vitae
Follow-up Survey Results	Faculty Handbook
Course Syllabi	Library Holdings
Information Booklet	Program Evaluation Data
Field Experience Notebook	Website
Course Evaluations	Program Evaluations
Exit Surveys	Master Teacher Evaluations
Faculty Evaluations	Supervisor Evaluations
Meeting Minutes and Agendas	Candidate Reflections

### Interviews Conducted

	Common Standards Cluster	Program Cluster	Totals
Program Faculty	3	44	<b>47</b>
Institutional Administration	9	0	<b>9</b>
Candidates	1	52	<b>53</b>
Graduates	17	27	<b>44</b>
Employers of Graduates	4	12	<b>16</b>
Supervising Practitioners/Master Teachers	8	36	<b>44</b>
Advisors	1	5	<b>6</b>
School Administrators	5	11	<b>16</b>
Credential Analyst	1	2	<b>3</b>
Advisory Committee	14	66	<b>80</b>
Field Supervisors	0	3	<b>3</b>
University Management	4	0	<b>4</b>
<b>Total</b>			<b>325</b>

*Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.*

## Background Information

Vanguard University is a comprehensive Christian university located in Costa Mesa, California. The purpose of Vanguard University is to pursue knowledge, cultivate character, deepen faith, and equip each student for a life of leadership and service. A hallmark of a Vanguard education is the emphasis on the relational and collaborative nature of learning. The university cultivates a campus climate that embraces a personal learning experience. Vanguard University had its beginnings in 1920 as a school to prepare Christian workers for the various ministries of the church. In 1939, the school was named the Southern California Bible College, the first four-year institution of the Assemblies of God. The school moved to the present campus in 1950, and the name of the school was changed to Southern California College. In July 1999, university status was received, and the name of the school was officially changed to Vanguard University. The School of Education is one of the eight schools of the university.

## Education Unit

The mission of the Vanguard University School of Education is to provide a supportive, reflective learning community in which teachers develop the professional relationships, skills, and knowledge base necessary to empower all students to reach their highest potential. In support of the mission, the College of Education has identified program targets and goals based on the program's mission and the university's overall educational targets and goals. The core program and curriculum are designed to produce students who will clearly articulate their mission as teachers, demonstrate specific pedagogical skills in line with California standards, demonstrate proficiency in assessment strategies, engage and support all students in learning – including English language learners, and demonstrate proficiency in creating effective environments for learning.

Vanguard University operates three different types of educator preparation programs: Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Clear Credential.

**Table 1: Programs Offered by Teacher Preparation University**

	<b>Program Level</b>	<b>Current Students</b>	<b>Program Completers 06-07</b>	<b>Expected Completers 07-08</b>	<b>Agency Reviewing the Program</b>
Multiple Subject	Initial	44	26	38	CTC
Single Subject	Initial	30	20	22	CTC
Clear Credential Program	Initial	9	5	8	CTC

## The visit

The visit to Vanguard University began on Sunday, February 24 at 1:00pm. The team members met at the hotel and were transported to the campus. A team meeting, document review and orientation to the programs offered by the institution were conducted by the team on Sunday afternoon. In addition, team members began meeting and talking with stakeholders. Data

collection continued on Monday and through Tuesday including school site visits. Team members visited four area schools where candidates are placed as student teachers. The faculty in these schools are comprised of many Vanguard graduates. The team met Monday night to discuss and coordinate data findings from Monday. On Tuesday morning, the team lead presented the Mid-Visit Report to the Dean of Education. On Tuesday evening, the team met to discuss all standards and programs. Consensus was reached on all standard findings and an accreditation recommendation. The Exit Report was held on the campus at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, February 27, 2008.

## CTC Common Standards

### Standard 1: Education Leadership

### Standard Met

The institution (faculty, dean/director and institutional administration) articulates and supports a vision for the preparation of professional educators. All professional preparation programs are organized, governed, and coordinated with the active involvement of credential program faculty. Institutional leadership fosters cohesiveness in management; delegates responsibility and authority appropriately; resolves each professional preparation program's administrative needs as promptly as feasible; and represents the interests of each program in the institution, the education profession, and the school community.

The School of Education at Vanguard University has a structure that includes an academic Dean who is supported by a Program Coordinator, a Credential Analyst, and an Administrative Assistant. Faculty serve as cohort leaders and teach courses in the credential, 5<sup>th</sup> Year, and MA programs.

Faculty are involved in the creation of program and delivery of coursework. Interviews with K-12 administrators revealed that faculty actively develop relationships with K-12 school personnel to ensure adequate student teaching placement sites. Interviews with the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC), graduates, and K-12 teachers show that the Vanguard University credential program meets the needs of the community; Vanguard University graduates are respected in the community.

Institutional leadership supports the programs in the School of Education. The President and the Provost of the University play a visible role in the activities of the School of Education. Faculty members in various academic departments support the School of Education through the subject matter programs; undergraduates at Vanguard University have the opportunity to complete one of several approved subject matter programs. The leadership in the institution meets regularly at the Teacher Education Council (TEC).

#### **Strengths in Standard Implementation:**

The institutional leadership is committed to Teacher Education. A mechanism exists that allows faculty from various departments in the University to collaborate on the preparation of teachers.

#### **Areas for Growth in Standard Implementation:**

Interviews with key personnel in the School of Education revealed that some program decisions are made by non-academic personnel. While faculty set criteria for admissions, decisions about candidate admission are made by the Program Coordinator and Credential Analyst. Delegation of academic program decisions to non-academic staff poses a concern. The program is encouraged to consider a structure where faculty are more involved with candidate admission decisions.

## Standard 2: Resources

## Standard Met with Concerns

Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for the effective operation of credential preparation program, to enable it to be effective in coordination, advising, curriculum, instruction, and field experiences. Library and media computer facilities, and support personnel, among others, are adequate.

Library and technology resources appear equitable and adequate. A tour of the library and an interview with the librarian, indicated that the library has a curriculum section that contains materials that K-12 teacher candidates can use to plan lessons. On-line and hard copy journals are available and are suitable for the academic needs of the program. The School of Education at Vanguard University has a computer lab that is used by students in the program for research and other academic activities.

The School of Education has three full-time staff to support the Graduate Education program. Additional support is provided by stipend paid personnel (e.g. Teaching Performance Assessment coordinator). Three faculty members teach full-time in the credential program. Other graduate and undergraduate faculty support the teaching credential program by teaching pre-requisite courses.

The University supports the professional needs of faculty. Annually, each faculty member is given professional development funds. All full-time faculty receive a lap top and have their own individual office.

The School of Education has limited and disconnected space for faculty offices. Due to space limitations, adequate space is not available for adjunct faculty and the coordinator of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA). One faculty office is housed away from the School of Education offices. Space issues limit the School's ability to hire more faculty or increase student enrollment.

The School of Education has recently fully implemented the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA). There is a concern that the current resources allocated for coordination of the TPA are not adequate to meet the growing responsibilities for the implementation of the TPA.

### **Areas for Growth in Standard Implementation:**

Facilities and classroom space may be insufficient for current and future enrollment.

More resources in personnel may be needed for the full implementation of the TPA.

### Standard 3: Faculty

### Standard Met

Qualified persons are hired and assigned to teach all courses and supervise all field experiences in each credential preparation program. Faculty reflect and are knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity. The institution provides support for faculty development, and recognizes and rewards outstanding teaching. The institution regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, and retains in credential programs only those individuals who are consistently effective.

The faculty in the School of Education at Vanguard University are dedicated and are well respected by their students. In interviews, students and graduates described their professors as caring and knowledgeable. Also, effective subject matter faculty in academic departments on campus add strength to the quality of the program.

Program documents and interviews clearly identify faculty who are sensitive to the needs of their students. Time and again, graduates praised the faculty for skillful teaching, caring dispositions, and enthusiasm for students' success.

The university supervisors assigned to supervise student teachers are knowledgeable about the teaching profession and are able to provide feedback and assistance on lesson planning and classroom management. However, some university supervisors are assigned to supervise candidates who do not necessarily match the supervisor's area of expertise. For example, a university supervisor with a single subject background was assigned to supervise in a kindergarten classroom.

#### **Areas for Growth in Standard Implementation:**

Faculty are encouraged to participate more actively in research and scholarly activities that support their teaching.

More consistent practices need to be implemented to ensure that candidates are supervised by university supervisors with appropriate content/level expertise.

#### **Standard 4: Evaluation**

#### **Standard Met with Concerns**

The institution regularly involves program participants, graduates, and local practitioners in a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of courses and field experiences, which leads to substantive improvements in each credential preparation program, as needed. Meaningful opportunities are provided for professional practitioners and diverse community members to become involved in program design, development and evaluation activities.

The School of Education gathers information about its programs from a variety of sources including exit surveys, course evaluations, informal conversations, and advisory committees. From interviews with former students, site administrators, and master teachers, it is clear that the program values the input of these constituencies.

Even though there appears to be a high level of collaboration and frequent interaction with members of the various constituencies, changes have been implemented through informal means; evidence has not been regularly or consistently gathered. Currently, there is no formalized process for regularly involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners in a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of the program.

The School is developing a process that will provide a mechanism for systematic data and information gathering, review of the data, and tracking actions or modifications made to the program based on the data. In addition, the University has hired an administrator who oversees institutional research and who will assist in the development of the data collection system. This process will enable the program to collect and utilize data systematically.

## **Standard 5: Admission**

## **Standard Met**

In each professional preparation program, candidates are admitted on the basis of well defined admission criteria and procedures (including all Commission-adopted admission requirements) that utilize multiple measures. The admission of students from a diverse population is encouraged. The institution determines that candidates meet high academic standards, as evidenced by appropriate measures of academic achievement, and demonstrate strong potential for professional success in schools, as evidenced by appropriate measures of personal characteristics and prior experience.

The School of Education, in consultation with Graduate Admission and based on CTC requirements, has established admissions criteria and procedures that include multiple measures such as undergraduate degree GPA, letters of recommendation, successful completion of subject matter preparation or CSET, and CBEST. These criteria are published, available through Graduate Admissions, in the School, and on the Vanguard University website.

Interviews of incoming credential candidates are conducted by the Graduate Program Coordinator, the Credential Analyst, and sometimes include the Dean of the School of Education. Admissions decisions are made based on meeting the prerequisite requirements and the interview.

There are provisions for students who do not meet the requirements for formal admissions. Candidates can take prerequisite courses during the summer semester prior to admission. Also, candidates are provisionally admitted if they have not demonstrated subject matter competence and are formally admitted upon completion of the CSET.

Interviews of current candidates and alumni indicated that candidates felt well-supported through the admission process.

### **Areas for Growth in Standard Implementation:**

Delegation of admissions decisions to non-academic staff poses a concern. Faculty members are encouraged to be more involved with the admission process.

**Standard 6: Advice and Assistance****Standard Met**

Qualified members of the institution's staff are assigned and available to advise candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, as the need arises, and to assist in their professional placement. Adequate information is readily available to guide each candidate's attainment of all program and credential requirements. The institution assists candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.

Information regarding programs and credential requirements is provided in written format and group orientation. Personnel from the School of Education visit undergraduate classes. An examination of student files indicated that the students are receiving appropriate information on their progress towards program completion.

Candidates consistently stated that faculty make themselves available to answer concerns about coursework. Candidates also noted that they can call upon university supervisors and faculty for assistance during their student teaching.

**Standard 7: School Collaboration****Standard Met**

For each credential preparation program, the institution collaborates with local school personnel in selecting suitable school sites and effective clinical personnel for guiding candidates through a planned sequence of fieldwork/clinical experiences that is based on a well developed rationale.

The University participates with many school districts to place students for introductory field experiences and student teaching. Collaboration is further enhanced by hiring local district personnel to serve as adjunct faculty in the teacher preparation program. The Teacher Education Advisory Committee (TEAC) comprised of personnel from local districts, program alumni, and university personnel meets regularly to discuss program issues.

Faculty members collaborated with local schools and created the "Subject Matter Mentors". These school teachers are introduced to credential candidates during the early part of their coursework and serve as a resource for real life classroom experiences.

Through interviews with public school administrators and faculty at the University, it was clear that faculty in the University collaborate with a local high school to create a teacher pipe-line. For example, students in the high school are identified and are given full scholarships by the University to earn an undergraduate degree and teaching credential.

**Strengths in Program Implementation:**

The administration, faculty, and students share a strong moral commitment to teaching that is evident in all aspects of the program. This commitment was mentioned by many of the field supervisors and K-12 administrators interviewed. In addition, the University's involvement with and financial support of prospective teachers at Century High from high school through the credentialing program is exemplary.

## **Standard 8: Field Supervisors**

## **Standard Met**

Each district-employed field experience supervisor is carefully selected, trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, and certified and experienced in either teaching the subject(s) of the class or performing the services authorized by the credential. District supervisors and supervisory activities are appropriately evaluated, recognized and rewarded by the institution.

Alumni from the credential program consistently stated that they felt supported by their district field supervisors. District field supervisors are qualified based on their experience and professional credentials. A comprehensive student teaching handbook is provided for field supervisors. The College of Education regularly holds orientation meetings for field supervisors.

### **Areas for Growth in Standard Implementation:**

The program is encouraged to ensure that prior to the beginning of each student teaching experience, all field supervisors are prepared and/or updated by university faculty to work with student teachers following Vanguard guidelines.

The program often relies on a local school district for the identification of field supervisors. While the University has selection criteria for field supervisors, there is no system in place to ensure that the criteria are actually used in the selection process. Through interviews, district field supervisors confirmed that they were often selected by their principal or are selected by the university primarily because the principals or local district personnel selected them.

## **Multiple Subject Credential Multiple Subject Internship Credential**

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, the program document, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met except for the following:

#### **Standard 3: Relationship between Theory and Practice** **Not Met**

While program coursework and fieldwork have a strong connection to practice, there is minimal consistent reference to the theoretical foundations upon which practice is based. The team did not find evidence of the use of primary sources on educational theory in course texts, instruction, or assignments.

The candidates and graduates interviewed were not consistently able to articulate the foundations of their own teaching practices or that of the program in which they had participated. Based on review of course syllabi, opportunities to analyze, implement, and reflect on the relationships between theory and practice related to teaching and learning are not consistently provided.

#### **Standard 4: Pedagogical Thought and Reflective Practice** **Met with Concerns**

Reflective practice is a strong component of the program. However, the team did not find sufficient evidence to show that candidates read, analyze, discuss, and evaluate professional literature pertaining to important issues in California schools and classrooms.

#### **Standard 5: Equity, Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum for All Children**

**Met with Concerns**

The team did not find evidence that candidates were aware of the protections afforded by law for identified segments of the population that ensure educational equity and physical, social, emotional, and intellectual safety for all children.

#### **Standard 8-A: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific content instruction by Multiple Subject (MS) candidates.** **Not Met**

While Elements a, b, and c are addressed in coursework, there was not sufficient evidence that Element (d), Visual and Performing Arts; Element (e), Physical Education; and Element (f) Health are addressed. The syllabi of course work required of the candidate does not include study of these content areas in their preparation for teaching.

#### **Standard 11: Preparation to Use Educational Ideas and Research** **Not Met**

After reviewing syllabi and interviewing candidates, the team could not find evidence that the basic foundations of child and adolescent development, human learning, and educational psychology were sufficiently addressed during the program. While the candidates have a strong practical grasp of teaching, they are not able to articulate an understanding of child development or the theoretical foundations of how people learn when reflecting upon that teaching.

**Standard 14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom**  
**Met with Concerns**

Elements 14.e and 14.f: While candidates were introduced to the provision of service to students with special needs, the team found when interviewing candidates and reviewing syllabi that application of that learning was not consistently integrated across the full range of the program activities. As a result, candidates also had difficulty in addressing the issues of social integration in their classrooms.

**Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors**  
**Met with Concerns**

Element e. The team's concern is related to the lack of consistency in the preparation of the field supervisors. The university hosts at least one event annually inviting field supervisors to attend, but attendance not required. Based on interviews with field supervisors and student teachers, it appears that the expectations were often explained by the student teacher, and in some cases the university supervisor was not involved until after the teaching experience began. As a consequence, some field supervisors were only minimally aware of the University's expectations and policies. For example, several former student teachers indicated that their master teachers were often not in the classroom and therefore unavailable for regular feedback.

**Standard 18: Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments during the Program**  
**Not Met**

The candidates' progress through the program of sequenced coursework and supervised fieldwork does reflect increasingly complex and challenging pedagogical assignments and tasks. However, assessment of these tasks is based partially on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) rather than full use of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) as they apply to the subjects to be authorized by the credential.

18 (b) The team found that field supervisor assessments in the fieldwork sequence use an evaluation based on the CSTP. Therefore, (1) candidates are not able to address the full range of the TPE as they apply to and/or are used in the teaching of reading, (2) the major domains of the TPE as they apply to and/or are used in the teaching of mathematics, science, history-social science, the arts, physical education and health, and (3) TPE 7: Teaching English learners as it applies to and/or is used in the teaching of English language development.

18(d) The evaluation completed by the field supervisors at the midpoint and completion of the field experience is based on the CSTP. The anecdotal evaluation used by the university supervisors addresses the domains for the TPE.

18(e) In course work, candidates are doing tasks that scaffold the TPA. However, field supervisors indicated a lack of knowledge of the TPA.

18(f) While candidates reported that feedback was received based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), they indicated that they did not receive feedback that addressed the TPE as specified in Element b.

18(g) There appears to be a lack of scheduled consultation between program supervisor, course instructors and master teachers in planning student's pedagogical tasks in required coursework.

**Single Subject Credential Program**  
**Single Subject Credential and Single Subject Internship Program**

**Findings on Standards**

After thorough review of the institutional report, a careful analysis of all supporting documentation, interviews of university and program administrators, Single Subject program faculty and support staff, current candidates, graduates, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that most of the program standards are met with the exception of the following.

**Standard 3: Relationship between Theory and Practice**

**Not Met**

While program coursework and fieldwork have a strong connection to practice, there is minimal consistent reference to the theoretical foundations upon which practice is based. The team did not find evidence of the use of primary sources on educational theory in course texts, instruction, or assignments.

The candidates and graduates interviewed were not consistently able to articulate the foundations of their own teaching practices or that of the program in which they had participated. Based on review of course syllabi, opportunities to analyze, implement, and reflect on the relationships between theory and practice related to teaching and learning are not consistently provided.

**Standard 4: Pedagogical Thought and Reflective Practice**

**Met with Concerns**

Reflective practice is a strong component of the program. However, the team did not find sufficient evidence to show that candidates read, analyze, discuss, and evaluate professional literature pertaining to important issues in California schools and classrooms.

**Standard 5: Equity, Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum for All Children**

**Met with Concerns**

The team did not find evidence that candidates were aware of the protections afforded by law for identified segments of the population that ensure educational equity and physical, social, emotional, and intellectual safety for all children.

**Standard 11: Preparation to Use Educational Ideas and Research**

**Not Met**

After reviewing syllabi and interviewing candidates, the team could not find evidence that the basic foundations of child and adolescent development, human learning, and educational psychology were sufficiently addressed during the program. While the candidates have a strong practical grasp of teaching, they are not able to articulate an understanding of child development or the theoretical foundations of how people learn when reflecting upon that teaching.

**Standard 14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom**  
**Met with Concerns**

Elements 14.e and 14.f: While candidates were introduced to the provision of service to students with special needs, the team found when interviewing candidates and reviewing syllabi that application of that learning was not consistently integrated across the full range of the program activities. As a result, candidates also had difficulty in addressing the issues of social integration in their classrooms.

**Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors**  
**Met with Concerns**

Element e. The team's concern is related to the lack of consistency in the preparation of the field supervisors. The university hosts at least one event annually inviting field supervisors to attend, but attendance not required. Based on interviews with field supervisors and student teachers, it appears that the expectations were often explained by the student teacher, and in some cases the university supervisor was not involved until after the teaching experience began. As a consequence, some field supervisors were only minimally aware of the University's expectations and policies. For example, several former student teachers indicated that their master teachers were often not in the classroom and therefore unavailable for regular feedback.

**Standard 18: Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments during the Program**  
**Not Met**

18 (b) The team found that field supervisor assessments in the fieldwork sequence use an evaluation based on the CSTP. Therefore, (1) candidates are not able to address the full range of the TPE as they apply to and/or are used in the teaching of reading, (2) the major domains of the TPE as they apply to and/or are used in the teaching of mathematics, science, history-social science, the arts, physical education and health, and (3) TPE 7: Teaching English learners as it applies to and/or is used in the teaching of English language development.

18(d) The evaluation completed by the field supervisors at the midpoint and completion of the field experience is based on the CSTP. The anecdotal evaluation used by the university supervisors address the domains for the TPE.

18(e) In course work, candidates are doing tasks that scaffold the TPA. However, field supervisors indicated a lack of knowledge of the TPA.

18(f) While candidates reported that feedback was received based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), they indicated that they did not receive feedback that addresses the TPE as specified in Element b.

18(g) There appears to be a lack of scheduled consultation between program supervisor, course instructors and master teachers in planning student's pedagogical tasks in required coursework.

## Clear Credential Program

### Findings on Standards:

After review of the program, supporting documentation and completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, program faculty, employers of graduates, school administrators and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards for the Clear Credential are met.

Standard 1: Advanced Study of Health Education	Met
Standard 2: Advanced Study of Teaching Special Education	Met
Standard 3: Advanced Study of Using Technology to Support Student Learning	Met
Standard 4: Advanced Study of Teaching English Learners	Met
Standard 5: Advanced Study of K-12 Core Academic Content and Subject Specific Pedagogy	Met
Standard 6: Advanced Study of Supporting Equity, Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum	Met

### Strengths in Program Implementation:

Interviews with candidates in the Clear Credential Program indicated that they found the coursework to be effective and relevant to them in their progress toward the Clear Credential. They also praised the quality and total engagement of the staff in providing a rigorous curriculum. Candidates expressed a high level of satisfaction with the program.

### Areas for Growth in Standard Implementation:

None noted.